UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,055	07/23/2003	Khoi Nhu Hoang	6518P002C	1434

7590 06/14/2006	EXAMINER
Daniel M. DeVos	LI, SHI K
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2613	

Daniel M. DeVos
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/626,055	HOANG ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Shi K. Li	2613

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _07 April 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-3,5,6,18-21,23-46,48-53,55-60,62-67,69-72,74 and 75_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-3,5,6,18-21,23-46,48-53,55-60,62-67,69-72,74 and 75_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Golmie et al. (N. Golmie et al., "A Differentiated Optical Services Model for WDM Networks",

IEEE Communications Magazine, February 2000) in view of Assi et al. (C. Assi et al., "Optical

Networking and Real-Time Provisioning: An Integrated Vision for the Next-Generation

Internet", IEEE Network, July/August 2001) and Kodialam et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub.

2002/0018264 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Golmie et al. teaches in FIG. 3 and Table 1 to divide a WDM network

into separate service levels. The difference between Golmie et al. and the claimed invention is

that Golmie et al. does not teach to determine service level topologies. However, it is obvious

that in order to setup lightpaths for various service levels in the WDM network, it is necessary to

determine network topologies. For example, Assi et al. teaches in FIG. 2 that a WDM network

can be considered as an N-layer network, where N is the number and wavelengths. Similarly, a

network with different service levels assigned to different wavelengths can be considered as a

multi-layer network. Kodialam et al. teaches in FIG. 2 to find network topologies for a service

level by eliminating links that are occupied. This gives a network topology that consists the

currently available links. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine

the teaching of Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. with the WDM network of Golmie et al. because

the approach of Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. provides a network topology that represents the

available resource that can be used for lightpath allocation. Thus it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine service level

topologies for each service level, as taught by Assi et al. and Kodialam et al., in the WDM

network of Golmie et al. because it provides network topologies that represent the available

resources that can be used for lightpath allocation for each service level.

Regarding claim 2, Golmie et al. teaches in Table 1 BER.

Regarding claim 3, it is understood that OSPF provides connectivity for each node and

network topology is the combination of connectivity for all nodes in the network.

Regarding claims 5-6, Assi et al. teaches in page 39, left col., 5th paragraph that optical

networks can also pose added wavelength continuity constraints. Kodialam et al. teaches in

paragraphs [0045] and [0046] that there are OXC with wavelength conversion capability and

there are OXC without wavelength conversion capability. In network consisting of OXC with

wavelength conversion capability, conversion criteria must be taken into consideration. In

network consisting of OXC without wavelength conversion, the conversion free constraint must

be met.

3.   Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al.

(N. Golmie et al., "A Differentiated Optical Services Model for WDM Networks", IEEE

Communications Magazine, February 2000) in view of Kodialam et al. (U.S. Patent Application

Pub. 2002/0018264 A1).

Golmie et al. teaches in FIG. 3 and Table 1 to divide a WDM network into separate service levels according to QoS criteria. The difference between Golmie et al. and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al. does not teach connectivity based on a conversion criteria. Kodialam et al. teaches in paragraphs [0045] and [0046] that there are OXC with wavelength conversion capability and there are OXC without wavelength conversion capability. In network consisting of OXC with wavelength conversion capability, conversion criteria must be taken into consideration to avoid blocking. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Kodialam et al. with the WDM network of Golmie et al. because wavelength conversion allows a light path to take different wavelengths along the path and avoid blocking while wavelength conversion is expensive and such resource is limited and must be shared among lightpaths. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take wavelength conversion into consideration, as taught by Kodialam et al., in the WDM network of Golmie et al. because wavelength conversion allows a light path to take different wavelengths along the path and avoid blocking while wavelength conversion is expensive and such resource is limited and must be shared among lightpaths.

Regarding claim 8, Golmie et al. teaches in Table 1 BER.

Regarding claim 9, Kodialam et al. teaches in paragraph [0024] to use link-state discovery method for tracking status of wavelengths.

4.   Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. as applied to claims 7-9 above, and further in view of Okajima et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2002/0120766 A1).

Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. have been discussed above in regard to claims 7-9. The difference between Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. do not teach comparing parameters of links with service level parameters. Okajima et al. further teaches in FIG. 5 to monitor variable link metrics to determine whether link metrics have been changed and update link metrics accordingly. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Okajima et al. with the modified WDM network of Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. because a link must meet service level criteria for providing the associated QoS. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compare link parameters with classification criteria, as taught by Okajima et al., in the modified WDM network of Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. because a link must meet service level criteria for providing the associated QoS.

5.   Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. as applied to claims 7-9 above, and further in view of Ashwood Smith (U.S. Patent 6,738,354 B1).

Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. have been discussed above in regard to claims 7-9. The difference between Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. do not teach wavelength availability table. Ashwood Smith teaches in FIG. 3 to use wavelength availability tables 28a, 28b and 30 during lightpath setup. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Ashwood Smith with the modified WDM network of Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. because a wavelength availability table keeps track of the availability of wavelengths and avoid assigning same wavelength to different lightpaths. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to include wavelength availability tables for keeping

track of whether a wavelength is allocated or available, as taught by Ashwood Smith, in the

modified WDM network of Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. because a wavelength availability

table keeps track of the availability of wavelengths and avoid assigning same wavelength to

different lightpaths.

6.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al. and

Kodialam et al. as applied to claims 7-9 above, and further in view of Matsuura et al. (U.S.

Patent Application Pub. 2003/0198227 A1).

       Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. have been discussed above in regard to claims 7-9. The

difference between Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. and the claimed invention is that Golmie et

al. and Kodialam et al. do not teach to use number of wavelength conversion as criteria.

Matsuura et al. teaches in paragraphs [0014] and [0017] that wavelength conversion devices are

expensive and the number of wavelength conversion is kept to a minimum in setting up a

lightpath. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of

Matsuura et al. with the modified WDM network of Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. to limit the

number of wavelength conversion used because wavelength conversion devices are expensive

and a OXC can have only limited number of wavelength conversion devices to be shared for all

lightpaths. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to use number of wavelength conversions as a criteria for service level, as

taught by Matsuura et al., in the modified WDM network of Golmie et al. and Kodialam et al. to

limit the number of wavelength conversions used because wavelength conversion devices are

expensive and a OXC can have only limited number of wavelength conversion devices to be shared for all lightpaths.

7.   Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al. (N. Golmie et al., "A Differentiated Optical Services Model for WDM Networks", IEEE Communications Magazine, February 2000) in view of Assi et al. (C. Assi et al., "Optical Networking and Real-Time Provisioning: An Integrated Vision for the Next-Generation Internet", IEEE Network, July/August 2001) and Kodialam et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2002/0018264 A1).

Regarding claim 14, Golmie et al. teaches in FIG. 3 and Table 1 to divide a WDM network into separate service levels. The difference between Golmie et al. and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al. does not teach separate network topology database. However, it is obvious that in order to setup lightpaths for various service levels in the WDM network, it is necessary to have separate network topology database for each service level. For example, Assi et al. teaches in FIG. 2 that a WDM network can be considered as an N-layer network, where N is the number and wavelengths. Similarly, a network with different service levels assigned to different wavelengths can be considered as a multi-layer network or N networks one for each service level. Kodialam et al. teaches in FIG. 2 to find network topologies for a service level by eliminating links that are occupied. This gives a network topology that consists the currently available links. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. with the WDM network of Golmie et al. because the approach of Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. provides a network topology that represents the available resource that can be used for lightpath allocation. Thus it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine service level

topologies for each service level, as taught by Assi et al. and Kodialam et al., in the WDM

network of Golmie et al. because it provides network topologies that represent the available

resources that can be used for lightpath allocation for each service level. Kodialam et al. teaches

in paragraph [0026] that IDR may be implemented by each node. That is, each node would store

a network topology database for each service level.

Regarding claim 15, Kodialam et al. teaches in paragraph [0045] that there are networks

without wavelength conversion (i.e., conversion free).

Regarding claim 16, Kodialam et al. teaches in paragraph [0026] that the route server 102

stores network topology databases.

8.   Claims 18-21, 24-25, 31-32, 34, 43-46 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Golmie et al. (N. Golmie et al., "A Differentiated Optical Services

Model for WDM Networks", IEEE Communications Magazine, February 2000) in view of Assi

et al. (C. Assi et al., "Optical Networking and Real-Time Provisioning: An Integrated Vision for

the Next-Generation Internet", IEEE Network, July/August 2001) and Kodialam et al. (U.S.

Patent Application Pub. 2002/0018264 A1).

Golmie et al. teaches in FIG. 3 and Table 1 to divide a WDM network into separate

service levels according to QoS criteria. Golmie et al. lists in Table 1 service level parameters

and in FIG. 3 the wavelengths corresponding to a service level. The difference between Golmie

et al. and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al. does not teach to form service level topology

structure. However, it is obvious that in order to setup lightpaths for various service levels in the

WDM network, it is necessary to determine and maintain network topologies. For example, Assi

et al. teaches in FIG. 2 that a WDM network can be considered as an N-layer network, where N

is the number and wavelengths. Similarly, a network with different service levels assigned to

different wavelengths can be considered as a multi-layer network. Kodialam et al. teaches in

FIG. 2 to find network topologies for a service level by eliminating links that are occupied. This

gives a network topology that consists the currently available links. One of ordinary skill in the

art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. with

the WDM network of Golmie et al. because the approach of Assi et al. and Kodialam et al.

provides a network topology that represents the available resource that can be used for lightpath

allocation. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to determine service level topologies for each service level, as taught by

Assi et al. and Kodialam et al., in the WDM network of Golmie et al. because it provides

network topologies that represent the available resources that can be used for lightpath allocation

for each service level.

Regarding claim 19, Golmie et al. teaches in Table 1 BER.

Regarding claim 20, Golmie et al. teaches in FIG. 3 that class 1 consists of channel $\lambda 1$

and $\lambda 2$, class 2 consists of channel $\lambda 3$ and $\lambda 4$, etc.

Regarding claim 21, Kodialam et al. teaches that IDR can be implemented by router

server 102 which is a centralized network server.

Regarding claims 24 and 31, Kodialam et al. teaches in paragraph [0041] to use OSPF

which constructs topology from link state database. OSPF also teaches to maintain connectivity

information to neighbors as link state.

Regarding claim 25, Golmie et al. teaches in Table 1 BER.

Regarding claim 32, Golmie et al. teaches in Table 1 BER.

Regarding claim 34, Golmie et al. teaches in p. 71, right col., last paragraph to p. 72, left col., first paragraph to classify link according to its qualities.

Regarding claim 43, Kodialam et al. teaches in FIG. 2 receive label switched path request.

Regarding claims 44 and 45, Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. discuss optical networks. Therefore, the path is a lightpath or optical circuit.

Regarding claim 46, Assi et al. teaches real-time provisioning.

Regarding claim 49, Kodialam et al. teaches in paragraphs [0045] network without wavelength conversion capability (i.e., conversion free).

9.   Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al. Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. as applied to claims 18-21, 24-25, 31-32, 34, 43-46 and 49 above, and further in view of Jukan et al. (A. Jukan et al., "Constraint-based Path Selection Methods for On-demand Provisioning in WDM Networks", IEEE INFOCOM 2002).

Golmie et al. Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. have been discussed above in regard to claims 18-21, 24-25, 31-32, 34, 43-46 and 49. The difference between Golmie et al. Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al. Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. do not teach to form intersection of the link service level channel sets and the links of a path. However, it is implicitly taught by OSPF, or it is taught by Jukan et al. Jukan et al. teaches in p. 832, left col., first paragraph to take intersection of service level channel and the path channel. A path exists only if the intersection of the link service level channel for all links is not null. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Jukan et al.

with the modified WDM network of Golmie et al. Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. because when

the intersection is null, connectivity using wavelength in the service level set is not possible.

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to form intersection of the service level channels set and links of a path, as taught by Jukan

et al., in the modified WDM network of Golmie et al. Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. because

when the intersection is null, connectivity using wavelength in the service level set is not

possible.

10.   Claims 26-29, 33 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. as applied to claims 18-21, 24-25, 31-32, 34,

43-46 and 49 above, and further in view of RFC-2328 (Moy, RFC-2328, "OSPF Version 2",

IETF, April 1998).

Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. have been discussed above in regard to

claims 18-21, 24-25, 31-32, 34, 43-46 and 49. The difference between Golmie et al., Assi et al.

and Kodialam et al. and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et

al. do not teach calculation of routing table and link management protocol. Kodialam et al.

teaches in paragraphs [0025] and [0041] to use OSPF, therefore RFC-2328, OSPF Version 2, is

included for the teaching of link management protocol. One of ordinary skill in the art would

have motivated to combine the teaching of RFC-2328 with the modified WDM network of

Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. because it is suggested by Kodialam et al.

Regarding claims 26-29, RFC-2328 teaches in Section 16 calculation of routing table.

Regarding claim 33, RFC-2328 teaches in Section 10 neighbor states for keeping track of

connectivity.

Regarding claims 35-36, RFC-2328 teaches in Section 16 calculating of routing table.

11.   Claims 30, 57-60, and 62-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. as applied to claims 18-21, 24-25, 31-32, 34, 43-46 and 49 above, and further in view of Melaku et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2003/0074443 A1).

Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. have been discussed above in regard to claims 18-21, 24-25, 31-32, 34, 43-46 and 49. The difference between Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. do not teach to change service level. Melaku et al. teaches in FIG. 5 QoS broker for handling service level change request. Melaku et al. teaches in paragraph [0056] that if a user decides to change QoS requirements in the midst of a session, new resources are to be reallocated and a new path that meets the requested QoS is established. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Melaku et al. with the modified WDM network of Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. because a QoS broker allows users to change service level depending on changes of their application needs. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a QoS broker for handling service level change requests, as taught by Melaku et al., in the modified WDM network of Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. because a QoS broker allows users to change service level depending on changes of their application needs.

12.   Claims 37-38, 40, 50-53, 56 and 71-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. as applied to claims 18-21, 24-25,

31-32, 34, 43-46 and 49 above, and further in view of Freeman ("Telecommunication System Engineering" by R. Freeman, John Wiley & Sons, 1980, pp 99-103).

Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. have been discussed above in regard to claims 18-21, 24-25, 31-32, 34, 43-46 and 49. The difference between Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. do not teach a machine-readable medium. Freeman teaches in Section 12 stored-program control (SPC). Freeman teaches in p. 100 to store method steps as program in memory for providing instructions to a controller or computer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Freeman with the modified WDM network of Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. because SPC is flexible and expandable such that it is easy to upgrade the system by rewriting the program. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use SPC and store program in machine-readable medium, as taught by Freeman, in the modified WDM network of Golmie et al., Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. because SPC is flexible and expandable such that it is easy to upgrade the system by rewriting the program.

13.   Claims 39 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman as applied to claims 37-38, 40, 50-53, 56 and 71-72 above, and further in view of RFC-2328 (Moy, RFC-2328, "OSPF Version 2", IETF, April 1998).

Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman have been discussed above in regard to claims 37-38, 40, 50-53, 56 and 71-72. The difference between Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al., Assi et al.,

Kodialam et al. and Freeman do not teach calculation of routing table and link management

protocol. Kodialam et al. teaches in paragraphs [0025] and [0041] to use OSPF, therefore RFC-

2328, *OSPF Version 2*, is included for the teaching of link management protocol. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to combine the teaching of RFC-2328 with the

modified WDM network of Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman because it is

suggested by Kodialam et al.

Regarding claim 39, RFC-2328 teaches in Section 10 neighbor states for keeping track of

connectivity.

Regarding claims 41-42, RFC-2328 teaches in Section 16 calculating of routing table.

14.   Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al.

Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. as applied to claims 18-21, 24-25, 31-32, 34, 43-46 and 49 above,

and further in view of Ashwood Smith (U.S. Patent 6,738,354 B1).

Golmie et al. Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. have been discussed above in regard to

claims 18-21, 24-25, 31-32, 34, 43-46 and 49. The difference between Golmie et al. Assi et al.

and Kodialam et al. and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al. Assi et al. and Kodialam et al.

do not teach to include status of wavelengths as either allocated or unallocated in the database.

Ashwood Smith teaches in FIG. 3 to use wavelength availability tables 28a, 28b and 30 during

lightpath setup. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the

teaching of Ashwood Smith with the modified WDM network of Golmie et al. Assi et al. and

Kodialam et al. because a wavelength availability table keeps track of the availability of

wavelengths and avoid assigning same wavelength to different lightpaths. Thus it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include

wavelength availability tables for keeping track of whether a wavelength is allocated or available, as taught by Ashwood Smith, in the modified WDM network of Golmie et al. Assi et al. and Kodialam et al. because a wavelength availability table keeps track of the availability of wavelengths and avoid assigning same wavelength to different lightpaths.

15.   Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman as applied to claims 37-38, 40, 50-53, 56 and 71-72 above, and further in view of Ashwood Smith (U.S. Patent 6,738,354 B1).

Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman have been discussed above in regard to claims 37-38, 40, 50-53, 56 and 71-72. The difference between Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman do not teach wavelength availability table. Ashwood Smith teaches in FIG. 3 to use wavelength availability tables 28a, 28b and 30 during lightpath setup. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Ashwood Smith with the modified WDM network of Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman because a wavelength availability table keeps track of the availability of wavelengths and avoid assigning same wavelength to different lightpaths. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include wavelength availability tables for keeping track of whether a wavelength is allocated or available, as taught by Ashwood Smith, in the modified WDM network of Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman because a wavelength availability table keeps track of the availability of wavelengths and avoid assigning same wavelength to different lightpaths.

16.　　　Claims 64-67 and 69-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Melaku et al. as applied to claims 30, 57-60 and 62-63 above, and further in view of Freeman ("Telecommunication System Engineering" by R. Freeman, John Wiley & Sons, 1980, pp 99-103).

　　　　　Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Melaku et al. have been discussed above in regard to claims 30, 57-60 and 62-63. The difference between Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Melaku et al. and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Melaku et al. do not teach a machine-readable medium. Freeman teaches in Section 12 stored-program control (SPC). Freeman teaches in p. 100 to store method steps as program in memory for providing instructions to a controller or computer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Freeman with the modified WDM network of Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Melaku et al. because SPC is flexible and expandable such that it is easy to upgrade the system by rewriting the program. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use SPC and store program in machine-readable medium, as taught by Freeman, in the modified WDM network of Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Melaku et al. because SPC is flexible and expandable such that it is easy to upgrade the system by rewriting the program.

17.　　　Claims 74-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman as applied to claims 37-38, 40, 50-53, 56 and 71-72 above, and further in view of Deo ("Graph Theory with Applications to Engineering and Computer Science" by N. Deo, Prentice-Hall, 1974).

Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman have been discussed above in regard to claims 37-38, 40, 50-53, 56 and 71-72. The difference between Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman and the claimed invention is that Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman do not teach to use a table or a tree to represent service level topology. Networks are mathematically represented as graphs. Deo teaches in chapter 7 to represent graphs as matrix (or table). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Deo with the modified machine-readable medium of Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman to represent network as matrix because matrices are better for computer processing. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to represent service level topology structures as table, as taught by Deo, in the modified machine-readable medium of Golmie et al., Assi et al., Kodialam et al. and Freeman.

Response to Arguments

18.   Applicant's arguments filed 7 April 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, the Applicant argues that neither Kodialam nor Assi relate their concepts to a service level. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Golmie teaches dividing WDM network into separate service levels. Considered as a whole, a skilled artisan would have been motivated to determine topologies for each service level. For example, referring to Table 1 of Golmie, if $\lambda1$ and $\lambda2$ are out-of-service

between node A and node B, then there is no class 1 service between node A and node B. That

is, there is no connectivity between node A and node B.

Regarding claim 7, the Applicant argues that Kodialam simple describes that a network

could have either conversion free OXCs or conversion OXCs and does not relate this concept to

a service level. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually

where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413,

208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir.

1986). Golmie teaches dividing WDM network into separate service levels. Considered as a

whole, a skilled artisan would have been motivated to apply conversion constraint with service

level. For example, referring to Table 1 of Golmie, conversion would only be allowed between

$\lambda 1$ and $\lambda 2$, or between $\lambda 3$ and $\lambda 4$, etc. That is, a lightpath must maintain the same service level.

Regarding claim 18, the Applicant argues that neither Kodialam nor Assi relate their

concepts to a service level. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references

individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642

F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375

(Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding claim 24, the Applicant argues that neither Kodialam nor Assi relate their

concepts to a service level. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references

individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642

F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375

(Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding claim 31, the Applicant argues that neither Kodialam nor Assi relate their concepts to a service level. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding claim 37, the Applicant argues that neither Kodialam nor Assi relate their concepts to a service level. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding claim 50, the Applicant argues that neither Kodialam nor Assi relate their concepts to a service level. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding claim 37, the Applicant argues that neither Kodialam nor Assi relate their concepts to a service level. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding claim 64, the Applicant argues that neither Kodialam nor Assi relate their concepts to a service level. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references

individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642

F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375

(Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding claim 71, the Applicant argues that neither Kodialam nor Assi relate their

concepts to a service level. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references

individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642

F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375

(Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

19.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Shi K. Li whose telephone number is 571 272-3031. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on 571 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

skl
8 June 2006

Shi K. Li
Patent Examiner